

JAN 18 2007

Atty. Docket No. CQ10139
PATENT APPLICATIONAMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/037,560REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-16, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 26 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Claims Rejection Under Section 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 8, 10-16, 19, 21, 23, 24 and 26 stand rejected as being anticipated by Keronen (USP 6,871,277). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection at least for the following reasons.

As to claim 1, the claim has been amended to define an expanded process, essentially making the rejection moot with respect to claim 1. More specifically, claim 1 now recites the process which utilizes the trust group definition feature and the rule list feature of the subject Application. The trust group definition feature is described in, e.g., paragraphs [0079] and [0080] and illustrated by Table 4. As shown, the trust group definition lists a trust value, a FromLower rules list, and a ToLower rules list. This is now incorporated into claim 1. The rules list feature is described in, e.g., paragraphs [0083] and [0084] and illustrated by Table 8. Finally, the process for selecting the ultimate rule to be followed is also claimed in more details. Namely, the claimed process captures the description provided in, e.g., paragraph [0085], describing how to select the proper rule list (i.e., ToLower of the process or FromLower of the object), and paragraph [0086], describing how to select the proper rule from the selected rule list. Applicant respectfully submit that Keronen fails to disclose or suggest this claimed process as recited in Claim 1.

Atty. Docket No. CQ10139
PATENT APPLICATION

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/037,560

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-6 and 8-12 are allowable.

With respect to claim 13, while the rejection of this claim was treated together with the rejection of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 is directed to a subject matter that is different from that of rejected claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection, as phrased, is not applicable to claim 13. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Keronen fails to anticipate or make obvious the subject matter of claim 13. More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Keronen fails to disclose or suggest at least the limitations:

define a first and a second rule sets, each of said rule sets comprising a plurality of rules defining an action based on an operation type
define a table of at least two trust groups, wherein each trust group comprise one trust group value and said first and second rule sets
determine whether to allow the operation by following the rules of said first rule set if the trust group value of the process is not smaller than the trust group of the object and
following the rules of said second rule set if the trust group value of the process is smaller than the trust group value of the object

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-16, 19, and 21 are allowable.

Atty. Docket No. CQ10139
PATENT APPLICATION

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/037,560

With respect to claim 23, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim, as amended, recites features that patentably distinguish from Keronen. For example, the claim recites that the process trust list is initiated in the RAM upon the start of the computer. No such feature is disclosed or suggested by Keronen. The claim further recites that when a process is created, a process trust value is assigned to the process, and the value is then entered in the process trust list in the RAM. This feature is not disclosed or suggested by Keronen. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Keronen fails to disclose generating a list of rules defining actions based on object type and operation type.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 23 and its dependent claims 24 and 26 are allowable.

II. Claims Rejection Under Section 103

Claims 2 and 9 stand rejected as being obvious from Keronen. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 9 are patentable by definition from their dependence on allowable claim 1.

III. Conclusion


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Atty. Docket No. CQ10139
PATENT APPLICATION

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/037,560

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph Bach
Registration No. 37,771

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE


23493

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: January 18, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office this 18th day of January, 2007.


Sarah K. Flohr